



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"It is not desirable to dismember a large general library and deprive it of one or more of its sections; a large general library resembles a university and differs from the small special library as does a university from a school of technology. Its usefulness is lost if it is dismembered."

At the same time we know that, as already stated in this paper, a large university must have its departmental libraries, consisting of larger or smaller collections of books, according to the needs of each particular case. The existence of this need, however, does not justify a department in proceeding to build its library as if this particular department and its library constituted the entire university, with no other library or department within a radius of a hundred miles.

While there are no doubt many, even among those here present, who believe that a strict adherence to the idea conveyed by Mr. Lyster's resolution—to permit no separation or detachment of any section of a university library from its regular place in the central building—would yield the best results for the least money, the demands of the teaching and research departments of our large universities are coming to be such that it would probably prove impossible for any institution, in the long run, to hold strictly to this principle. Theoretically it may well be the ideal towards which each university library should strive. No doubt all the books should as far as possible be classified and cataloged

as though parts of one single harmonious unit. In practice, however, some portion of them are likely to be loaned for definite or indefinite periods, to form more or less extensive departmental libraries.

Possibly mechanical or other technical devices may in time facilitate and simplify connection and communication between a distinct department and the central Library to such an extent that all the problems with which the present paper has endeavored to deal shall be solved; but until that has come to pass, the writer, knowing that the ideal—a large general library with strong departmental libraries consisting solely of duplicates, each library with its building, and up-to-date catalog—is impossible of attainment, would be highly pleased to see realized as a second choice, a large central library from which books may be borrowed for longer or shorter periods to supply the more urgent needs of a department. A third alternative which might be mentioned would call for the second plan, but with the privilege of loan extended to include, especially in the case of certain scientific departments, also the main classes of books representing the subjects taught in these departments.

Whether the first plan, to which the system of the Clark University library most nearly approximates; the second or third, or some compromise between the three, is to be adopted, becomes an administrative matter to be settled by each university according to its lights and its means.

A PLAN FOR A CENSUS OF RESEARCH RESOURCES

BY CLEMENT W. ANDREWS, *Librarian the John Crerar Library, Chicago*

It is evident that the fact that a collection is called special by the library, possessing it, is no guarantee that it is of special value to a scholar. On the other hand, a list of these special collections is by no means exhaustive of any subject, for even if the holdings of all special libraries—for example, those of natural history so-

cieties and the medical societies—were listed, there would still remain those of the larger public libraries, the general reference libraries and above all, the libraries in Washington. The proposition I submit, therefore, is that a census be taken of all these resources, so that scholars may be able to ascertain all the places where con-

siderable amounts of material in their lines are to be found.

For this purpose some uniform method of estimating the size of the holdings should be agreed upon. The usual one of stating that a library contains so many volumes and so many pamphlets, as provided for by the rules of the A. L. A., is better than nothing, but it is not entirely satisfactory. Mr. Currier has pointed out that the older libraries have many volumes of bound pamphlets, the value of which is not adequately measured by the number of the volumes. On the other hand, the number of titles is also inadequate, because a collection may be rich in volumes of periodicals or other serials. Is there not wanted a term which will signify the total of pamphlets, whether bound or unbound, and bound volumes, except those made up of pamphlets? Would "pieces" be satisfactory? The name is not very important because the term would be defined in the beginning and only numbers given in the body of the work. A single number would be clearer to the users of the list than two or more, as well as more economical.

The arrangement should be a classed one. For instance, special collections on coleoptera should follow those on entomology and those again on zoology. With such an arrangement an index will refer to all the information available, whereas an alphabetized arrangement of the subjects would require many cross references and still not insure this comprehensiveness. Moreover, a considerable economy in printing and a

greater legibility of the page could be secured by varying the degree of division of the classes in accordance with the number of entries on them. For instance, under English drama, Shakespeare would of course be treated separately, but most of the minor dramatists would be included under the general heading, stating of course the name of the author or authors to which each collection is devoted.

The system of classification should be one in print and in fairly general use; in other words, either the Decimal or that of the Library of Congress.

It is not proposed to take a census of the library resources of the country, which indeed would be a formidable undertaking, but one of special research material. It would therefore take no account of moderate sized general collections containing few unusual books and so would exclude most of the holdings of most libraries and include all the holdings of very few, if any.

Many interesting and important details could be determined only by investigation and after careful consideration, but the object appears to me both desirable and feasible and I would suggest the appointment of a committee to take it up.

(In the discussion which followed a general approval of the plan was expressed. Several units in which the size of the collection could be stated were proposed, among them "titles" and "titles and numbers." One member of the section called attention to the desirability of giving the dates covered by the collection whenever these could be stated definitely.)

THE RETURN OF COÖPERATIVE INDEXING

By E. C. RICHARDSON, *Librarian, Princeton University*

The huge increase in the output of books since the cheapening of printing and paper, together with the increasing tendency to produce in the form of collective monographs by various authors; periodicals, transactions, festschriften, and even

encyclopedias with long signed articles, make the matter of analytical cataloging, or whole-article indexing, one of the most urgent of library problems. Literature has become a labyrinth and the need of a clue to it imperative. The vast waste of